

REMARKS***Status of the claims***

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 12, 17 and 18 are independent. Claims 1-18 are amended. Applicants believe that these changes introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The Specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In making this objection the Examiner asserts on page 2 of the Office Action that certain portions of the Discussion of the Invention section are unclear.

In particular, the Examiner alleges that on page 2, line 5 of the Specification, it is not clear what is characterized. The first paragraph on page 2 of the Specification has been amended. Applicants assert that this amendment removes any potential lack of clarity.

Also, the Examiner states that on page 3, line 11 of the Specification, the phrase “any one of the preceding claims” is unclear. This phrase as been changed to “any one of the preceding features.”

The Examiner also asserts that the phrase an axis substantially parallel to the main axis, as recited in claim 8, does not have clear support in the Specification. Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to the third paragraph on page 5 of the Specification. In this paragraph, an axis of revolution of a paraboloid is described with reference to a main axis A2. Moreover, this claim language is found in the Specification on page 3, lines 1-3.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the Specification be withdrawn.

Objections to the claims

Claims 1-16 are objected to for containing minor informalities. These claims have been amended to remove these informalities. Accordingly, Applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants request that these rejections be withdrawn in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim 1 recites “when said vehicle is describing a curved path defining a bend, said first beam is oriented towards the inside of the bend.” On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that “the inside of the bend” is unclear. Applicants assert that it is clear to describe for a bend, an outside relative direction and an inside relative direction. Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 2, the Examiner states that inclusion of the recited upper part is unclear. As amended, claim 2 is directed to a light, “further comprising an upper part.” Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 5, as originally presented, recited “defining the said axis of rotation vertically during operation of the headlight.” The Examiner asserts that from this language, it is not clear what defines the axis of rotation. As amended, claim 5 recites “wherein said axis of rotation is oriented vertically during operation of the headlight.” Applicants assert that any potential lack of clarity has been removed by these changes.

Claim 8, as originally presented, recited “defining a main axis.” The Examiner asserts that this phrase is unclear. As amended, claim 8 recites that the light further comprises a substantially horizontal main axis. Moreover, the Examiner asserts that “said lamp,” as recited in line 3 of claim 8 is unclear. This phrase has been replaced with “said first and second light sources.”

Claim 9 recites “means for defining a cut-off line.” The Examiner asserts that inclusion of this means is unclear. As amended, claim 9, clearly recites that the recited light comprises the means for defining a cut-off.

With respect to claim 10, the Examiner asserts that “adapted to produce,” as originally recited, is unclear. Amended claim 10 no longer recites this phrase.

The Examiner states that certain terms in claims 12, 13, 17, and 18 are unclear. Claims 12, 17, and 18 have been rewritten in independent form. Applicants assert that any potential lack of clarity has been removed by these changes.

Dependent claims 3, 4, 6, 7, and 14-16 were rejected for depending from claim 1. However, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 11-14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,309,094 to Woerner (hereinafter Woerner). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a vehicle headlight. The headlight recited in claim 1 includes a lamp having a first light source and a second light source. On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Figure 5 of Woerner discloses this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree. Figure 5 of Woerner is a diagrammatic view of the front of a motor vehicle. This diagrammatic view includes two headlights, not a lamp of a headlight having a first light source and a separate light source.

Moreover, it appears that each of the headlights in Figure 5 of Woerner merely includes a single light source. This is supported by incandescent bulb 20, which is shown in Figures 1-3 of Woerner. Woerner is silent with regard to incandescent bulb 20 containing multiple light sources.

Further technical differences exist between the present invention and Woerner. For instance, the headlight of claim 1 also includes first and second reflective surfaces that produce first and second light beams, respectfully. On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that this feature is also shown in Figure 5 of Woerner. However, as set forth above, Figure 5 merely shows two headlights, not a single headlight that produces first and second light beams, as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Figures 6-7 of

Woerner show that each of the individual headlights disclosed in this patent merely produce a single light beam.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over Woerner for at least the reasons set forth above. Independent claims 12 and its dependent claims, as well as independent claims 17 and 18, recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also patentable over Woerner. Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

A check for \$84.00 is enclosed for covering the fees for addition of one independent claim. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1948-4765.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN

Dated: July 7, 2003

By:



John A. Harroun
Registration No. 46,339
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

Mailing Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154